

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(PUBLIC PARTICIPATION)**

June 3, 2003

7:00 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Forest.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Osborne, Pinard, O’Neil,
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest

Mayor Baines advised that the purpose of the special meeting is to give residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the Board on items of concern affecting the community; that each person will be given only one opportunity to speak; that comments shall be limited to two minutes to allow all participants the opportunity to speak and any comments must be directed to the Chair.

Mayor Baines requested that any resident wishing to speak come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized, and give their comments.

Julie Todd, 962 Valley Street, Manchester stated:

Good evening. My name is Julie Todd. I am the Pastor of First United Methodist Church on Valley Street. I am also a leader in the Granite State Organizing Project. I was here two weeks ago speaking to you in support of the Responsible Employer Ordinance or REO and I watched in great dismay as the Board voted to receive and file it. I was particularly dismayed at the following. Every single person who spoke in favor of this ordinance was a resident of Manchester. All of them are active citizens and participants in churches, community organizations and unions. All of these same people are gathered here this evening, especially representing the Granite State Organizing Project and I would like anyone from GSOP to raise their hand. We spoke of the substantial changes that our group had made to the REO – months and months worth of conversations gaining input from contractors and City officials. All we asked for was a fair hearing and a discussion of this new document. All we asked for was a fair hearing and you denied us a fair hearing by receiving and filing the REO. It was as if you didn’t even listen to us, your constituents, the

residents of Manchester. It was as if all you heard were the voices of the contractors who spoke against the REO. The vast majority of whom were not from Manchester and the entirety of whom if they are truly acting as responsible employers will not be affected by this ordinance. The ordinance has substantial changes and it is still open to change. I cannot understand why you would oppose giving it a fair hearing. Please consider voting to allow this responsible employer ordinance to go to committee. Thank you very much.

Mary Wellemeyer, 100 Prospect Street, Manchester stated:

I serve the Unitarian Universalist Church as their minister. I support the Responsible Employer Ordinance as it has been revised because I want to live in a community where people who work hard have a chance to get ahead and a place where people with jobs are able to provide their families with health insurance. I am in favor of a system of contracting that encourages businesses to be responsible and doesn't reward contractors that cut corners by taking away opportunities for hard working people to get the training they need and taking away the opportunities for hard working people to have health insurance. I hope you will give this ordinance a fair hearing. I endorse having it discussed in committee. Please do take the Responsible Employer Ordinance, as rewritten, seriously. Thank you.

Karen Hetes, 23 Edgar Street, Manchester stated:

I am from Ward 1. I have looked at this Responsible Employer Ordinance and I really feel that you should give it the opportunity to go to committee and discuss it. Alderman Gatsas, I have met you before at different functions and I really feel that you need to give this an opportunity to be discussed for people to get the healthcare that they need or at least make it available for them. Also, having available for these people who need training to get into an apprenticeship program. Thank you.

John Gallagher, 231 Merrimack Street, Manchester stated:

I am the Pastor of St. Anne and St. Augustin parishes here in Manchester. I am also a member of the Granite State Organizing Project (GSOP). Our members are from Greater Manchester, from Nashua and from the Souhegan Valley. We are from the cities and the towns and the surrounding communities that make our state great and we strongly believe in the democratic process that insures a fair hearing for all sides of the issue. I am here to urge you to support the continued dialogue surrounding the Responsible Employer Ordinance, which is scheduled to be voted to committee later this evening. Exactly one year ago tonight more than 200 members of GSOP met and voted to address the concerns of citizens about jobs, healthcare, affordable housing and education and these concerns surfaced for more than 100 house meetings that had taken place over a six week period last spring. Since that time, members of our organization have been meeting with representatives of labor, with contractors and with ordinary tax paying citizens to hammer out a Responsible Employer Ordinance that is beneficial to all involved. The bill that exists today is very different from the bill that existed last June 1. Obviously, more work needs to be done and the committee is

a good place to do it. I hope you will allow the process to continue so that we can assure a fair and effective REO.

Guy Kalasi, 385 Concord Street, Manchester stated:

(spoke in French and had an interpreter)

I am a lawyer and defender of human rights from the democratic republic of Lecongo.

Presently I am studying English as a Second Language and I am making use of the computer at the MCRC, Manchester Community Resource Center, and I am grateful to you for the opportunity to enter and use that center. I am quite pleased with the REO process and that it is a democratic process to guarantee social justice and one that defends and protects human rights, that is both of the employers as well as the employees, especially those employees that are defenseless. It seems to me that the REO process should be allowed to continue and that the committee continue to discuss employee rights that pertain to healthcare benefits, job training and other social needs. If you do so allow this committee to continue, you will have met your responsibility and the right to be called defenders of the rights of both the employee and the employer. Thank you for listening to me and for your attention.

Geoff Ashman, 25 Maybrook Avenue, Manchester stated:

I am a member of the Granite State Organizing Project. I am here to speak in favor of the Responsible Employer Ordinance, the REO, and I ask for your vote to send it to committee. Some might think the Responsible Employer Ordinance is a clear case of management versus labor, Republican versus Democrat. If that is the case, then why would I, a lifelong Republican who has only worked in management and has no ties with labor, why would I come and speak on its behalf. Well it is because I see the REO as a clear case of planning for the long-term versus reacting for the short-term and doing what is best for the long run versus what is easiest to do today. If our City is to continue to grow stronger, our workforce must grow stronger too. Developing the skills of our people with apprenticeship programs and craft training processes, making health insurance available and making sure that workers who meet the definition of employees are properly classified as employees and not independent contractors. This is what the REO ordinance is all about. It will also discourage seeing people as simply what can you do for me today with little or no concern about tomorrow. The REO is both the right thing to do as well as what is best for our community. All I ask, though, is that you vote to send the Responsible Employer Ordinance to committee.

Phoebe Stone, 224 Frederick Street, Manchester stated:

I am a registered voter in Ward 10. I am also here as a member of the Granite State Organizing Project and I am here to speak in favor of reconsidering this bill and sending it to committee. I serve on the Healthcare Committee of GSOP and one of the important provisions of this bill is to make healthcare insurance available to people who would be covered by it. I am also in favor of having an apprenticeship program to allow for advancement. Thank you.

Gregg Ziemba, 417 Canal Street, Manchester stated:

I am a contractor here in Manchester with 33 employees residing in Manchester. My company is Empire Sheet Metal and B.A. Roy Steel Erect. My employees are trained on a consistent basis and being insured has helped them and their families. I do not encourage or practice independent contracting for purposes of fraud, however, I recognize the need for responsible employer language. I recognize the benefit to my employees and to my community. This ordinance would benefit Manchester's workers and would not harm my business in any way, whether it is further administration work or an increase in pay. These issues seriously deserve further consideration.

Fred Plett, 65 Wallace Road, Goffstown stated:

I am a member of the Granite State Organizing Project for the Diocese of Manchester. Geoff Ashman stole my thunder a little bit. If the Responsible Employer Ordinance is perceived to be union backed, I am not union. I am white collar. I was a former officer for Public Service Co. of NH. I am a Republican, a conservative Republican, sorry Mayor. It has nothing to do with partisanship. It has nothing to do with party. It is just the right thing to do. I have been supporting this and working on it since it came to you last time and I am personally responsible for a lot of the change that occurred in it to take away some of the things that I perceived to be unfair to contractors. Now it only refers to healthcare. It doesn't say who picks up the cost. Now it does not require filing of any paperwork unless there is a complaint that is accepted on payroll so there is no invasion of privacy unless there is just cause for doing so. It refers to not misclassifying workers, which is following the law. I frankly find it very hard to understand why a responsible contractor would fight this. It is doing the right thing. I came to this conclusion through Catholic Social Doctrine. I happen to be a Catholic. There is a classic written by Pope Leo XIII in 1893 called Rarum Novarum, which supported very much private property, land ownership, and capitalism but also said treat a worker fairly and that is what this does. I urge the support of at least studying this and if it needs some additional tweaking, fine, but at least give it that opportunity. Thank you very much.

Paul Crawford, 231 Merrimack Street, Manchester stated:

I am not just a member of GSOP; I am also the President. The GSOP is a community of organizations. Some of the organizations we have in our community are Blessed Sacrament Parish in Ward 9, St. Catherine's Parish, Transfiguration Parish, Unitarian Universalist Church in Manchester, the Episcopal Church in Manchester, St. Anne's, St. Augustin's, the National Association of Social Workers NH Chapter. So we are a community of organization and we are here tonight simply to ask you to reconsider this REO. We believe in dialogue. We believe that we can work out a compromise. We ask for your reconsideration tonight of that REO to put it in committee so we can work on it and hopefully with some of the help of the Aldermanic Committee bring out an REO that is able

to help our City and all of our employees. We feel that the issue is a very important issue to the citizens of Manchester and we ask that we have time to discuss it. Thank you.

Jeff Kassell, 22 Appleton Street, Manchester stated:

I am not really here to talk about the REO but as I understand it, I support it. I think people should have health insurance and other benefits. I was reading the paper today and I get all my news from *The Union Leader* and the comment of Mayor Baines to Mr. Pappas' remarks as Mr. Pappas is running for Mayor. What Mayor Baines said was Pappas' comments show that he doesn't understand local government and needs to sit down and learn about it. "This is the big leagues now." Baines said. Big leagues. It sounded a little condescending to me and a little patronizing and I felt a little sorry for Mr. Pappas because I am running for Mayor myself and maybe Mayor Baines thinks I am bush league too. We do have some major league things going on in this City. We have major league tax increases. We have major league potholes on virtually every street in the City. We have a major league incestuous relationship with sports developers that is costing us tens of millions of dollars that most of the public is not behind and we have an Aldermanic Board that seems to be all for that. We have major league increases in tuition costs for Bedford. We are not exactly being a great neighbor raising their tuition costs from \$6,000 per pupil to \$11,000 per pupil. It seems like a lot of money to me. I am going to boost my candidacy here for just a couple of seconds. Mayor Baines is a smart guy. I enjoy listening to him but I have one big advantage of Mayor Baines and some of the Alderman on this Board. I can do subtraction. There is not enough subtraction going on in this budget. A 13% increase in two years. That is a lot. We are going to see how many people are left on this Board of Aldermen after this next election because I am walking around town and a lot of people seem like they don't like it. Thank you.

Raymond Buckley, 24 Gabrielle Street, Manchester stated:

I serve as Chair of the Manchester Democratic Committee. This evening it is believed by many that the Board will be asked to at the very least send the proposed Responsible Employer Ordinance to Committee for further consideration. I appear before you this evening to express the unanimous opinion of those attending last evening's meeting of the City's Democratic Committee. The Democratic City Committee wishes to strongly encourage every member of this Board, whether they be a Democrat, Republican or Independent to send the Responsible Employer Ordinance to committee this evening. Such action will send a strong message to the taxpayers of Manchester. The taxpayers of Manchester deserve to know that their tax dollars are being used wisely. The taxpayers of Manchester understand that having more families with access to healthcare, a fair wage and educational opportunities are not only important to our community as a whole, but in the end will help elevate the standard of living of every single person here in Manchester. We must continue to move Manchester forward to the bright future that has been the promise of our City for so many generations. The Responsible Employer Ordinance is not only the morally right thing to do but the financially right thing to do as well. By treating all members of the

City, whether they be direct or indirect employees, with dignity and respect, we will make a better future for every resident of Manchester. There is simply no evidence from any other community anywhere across the county that the passage of a Responsible Employer Ordinance has led to higher taxes. It is simply a falsehood intended to mislead those of you in power to make such an important decision. On behalf of the unanimous vote of the Democratic City Committee, I strongly encourage you to support the motion this evening regarding the appropriately named Responsible Employer Ordinance. Thank you for your time.

Richard Moquin, 226 Coolidge Avenue, Manchester stated:

I am the owner of the law firm of Moquin & Daley at 226 Coolidge Avenue. I am here tonight to support the Responsible Employer Ordinance and urge that it be sent to Committee. Having provided legal representation to injured construction workers for over 30 years, I would like to address that portion of the ordinance prohibiting the misclassification of employees by their employers because in my practice I found that to be a very real problem. Misclassification of employees as so-called sub-contractors allows employers to avoid providing worker's compensation benefits to their employees. The way it works is like this. On Friday an employer shows up on a job with 15 men and they are hanging drywall. They are all covered by worker's compensation. On Monday, the same 15 men show up and they all agree to be treated as sub-contractors. They are no longer covered by worker's compensation. The employers reap a windfall profit because they choose not to have comp and they can outbid any responsible contractor who plays by the rules. Who gets hurt by this? The employees first of all. An employer who isn't going to provide worker's compensation benefits is certainly not going to provide health insurance or disability coverage. I have had clients who had to file bankruptcy because of this problem. The responsible employer, what does he do? He either goes out of business or stops playing by the rules. I urge you to send this bill to committee because it is the right thing to do.

Irene Robie, 259 Chestnut Street, Manchester stated:

My topic tonight has nothing to do with what has already been presented. I have just been wandering around Douglas Street looking over the situation over there. I saw a beautiful, beautiful architectural drawing of the building that is being put up and I must say it really is a handsome looking building but I am still so worried about the parking. You are going to have to save four parking spaces for the directors. You are going to have to save four more parking spaces for the Meals on Wheels Program. You are going to have 50 more parking spaces for people who are going to go to the Library and then the law says that you take an average of all the seniors over 65 here in Manchester who are about to go over and enjoy the new center and you are going to have to put in all handicapped parking lots for them. I am wondering where the average person is going to park. I couldn't even see where you could put that many parking spots. I had a talk with Bob MacKenzie and he made me feel a little better about some things but he said don't worry about it, we will manage to do something if we don't have enough. But Mr. Mayor there was a Mr. Mayor 14 years ago and a Board of

Aldermen and they said up on Hanover Street don't worry we will take care of it. Are we repeating that problem again? I hope not. Thank you very much.

Harold Levine, 49 Hillcroft Road, Manchester stated:

Good evening. Every other week it seems I speak. Two weeks ago when I was here I presented to the Mayor and some of the Aldermen what I thought to try and save the taxpayers some money, the residential taxpayers. As I said two weeks ago, the residential taxpayers of Manchester are subsidizing the big power brokers who own all the large commercial real estate in the City. I want to thank Alderman Lopez who two weeks ago mentioned one of the items to the Board that I submitted and I also want to thank Alderman Thibault from Ward 11 for working behind the scenes with me on a couple of other items trying to save the City of Manchester and the taxpayers some money. I thought this crowd tonight was in opposition to the present Board and the Mayor of not trying to cut the tax rate any further. There is so much waste and I think it still goes back, Mr. Mayor, to the School Department. You are out of whack and throughout the City there is no competitive bidding going on on anything and we residential taxpayers are footing the bill for everything. Thank you.

Mayor Baines called for a recess.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order.

Paul DeLorie, 9 Heather Lane, Bow stated:

I am Vice President of Hampshire Fire Protection. We are a large fire sprinkler company in Londonderry and we are fortunate to do a good deal of work for the City. I am also on the Board of Directors of the Association of Builders and Contractors. My company and ABC support the goals of promoting pre-qualification and encouraging responsible employment practices. We promote social responsibility and good employer/employee relationships while we support cost effective delivery of construction services on time and on budget. The GSOP is aware that the proposed ordinance includes provisions that ABC cannot support. There are many issues that are unresolved. What is presented is essentially a draft. In particular, how can the City of Manchester monitor and enforce the provisions of the REO without incurring time and administrative costs, as well as the contractors time and administrative costs. Those are costs that will be passed on to the City. Will the administrative provisions discourage contractors currently performing satisfactorily for the City from bidding on future work for the City of Manchester? Thank you.

Kathy Sullivan, 192 South Mammoth Road, Manchester stated:

I am both a residential and a commercial property taxpayer in the City of Manchester and if the budget passes will be paying a little bit more money for parking in the Millyard to help balance the budget but that is okay because we like to provide parking for our employees. We think it is a responsible thing to do. On that note I am here to ask that the Aldermen do

pass along to committee the Responsible Employer Ordinance. I don't understand what can be wrong with having a hearing, just a hearing on an ordinance that would give access to healthcare. I am not saying who is going to pay for it but access to healthcare, training through apprenticeship programs and accountability to make sure that the laws are being enforced. I don't know how anyone can be against that. It makes no sense. As a taxpayer in the City of Manchester I think it is important that as we move forward and grow and progress as a City that our workforce is treated the right way. Manchester is not a wealthy City. We are a working class City. We have an obligation. You have an obligation. We all have an obligation to make sure that our workers in this City who make up the bulk of your constituents are treated correctly. If employers are going to make money from dealing with the City of Manchester, I want to make sure that my taxpayer dollars that are being used to provide that profit to them are also being used to treat our workers correctly and I would, therefore, ask that you support that. Also, I am the Chairman of the NH Democratic Party and responsible employment is part of the Democratic platform in the State of New Hampshire. I would ask all Aldermen, Democrat, Republican or Independent to please support this. Thank you.

Gary Abbott, 48 Grandview Road, Bow stated:

I am the Executive Vice President of the Associated General Contractors of NH, a statewide organization representing commercial and industrial contractors. I am here before you tonight as I was a year ago, back when this employer ordinance was discussed really to refresh the memory of what this really was about as we opposed the Responsible Employer Ordinance. There was similar legislation that was tried, some parts of the employer ordinance was tried in the Legislature in 2001 and in 2002 you took it under committee and reviewed it and voted that it not pass. We have looked at the more recent version and still many of those same policy questions are of concern so, therefore, I am coming to you tonight to tell you that we do not support the Responsible Employer Ordinance that is being proposed or reconsidered. With that, too, I would also let you know that you have to understand that the Responsible Employer Ordinance in Manchester will cover an awful lot of commercial and industrial projects, both at the Airport and in the City. There are an awful lot of responsible contractors and adequate state laws on the books to cover some of those scenarios that you have heard tonight. I just wanted to make sure that the Aldermen are aware that the Associated General Contractors of NH oppose the Responsible Employer Ordinance. Thank you very much.

Kevin Lefebvre, 16 Depot Street, Weare stated:

I was a 30 year resident of the City of Manchester and my family wanted a lot of woods behind them so I ended up moving. I do have ties to the City. I am here to speak against the REO. There are already a lot of laws on the state books covering misclassification of employees and other fractions that the other people are talking about. What I am pointing out is that you guys are going to add another layer of bureaucracy to the entire situation. If you insist on going in that direction the only thing I can suggest is that you scrap this

ordinance completely and turn around and pass a City wide ordinance that states that every company that works in the City of Manchester and everybody who has employees who live in the City of Manchester must provide the same healthcare. That seems to be the biggest issue they are talking about. If healthcare is such a big issue then why not do it so every single employee within City limits has it. I mean if it is good for the contractor, which is what guys are saying that we are so irresponsible...if I am irresponsible I am out of business. My employees will leave me. You are saying that I am irresponsible because I don't want to fill out all of your paperwork and do this stuff well then why not go after the other ones? The hotel chains that are coming in here with their chambermaids and gas stations and the theme stores. Get them all to give the same health plan they are trying to put on to us that you say we are not providing. I want to thank you very much for your time and again you have voted against this in the past and hopefully you continue with your votes. Thank you.

Will Infantine, 89 Winward Lane, Manchester stated:

I am a taxpayer. I own a business that resides here in Manchester. I am also a member of the NH House. On Thursday I am going to the well of the floor to try to get \$44,000 back for the City of Manchester. Under Paul Martineau's regime as Welfare Commissioner, he realized that approximately \$44,000 was given incorrectly through rooms & meals tax through these hotel rooms that were purchased for people needing shelter. Hold that thought. I am also here tonight about this employer friendly ordinance. While I support the GSOP and would be proud to be a member of their organization, there is something in this ordinance that is bad. There is a mechanism that allows for a grievred party to have to provide information on certified payrolls. Let's be honest folks. There is only one reason an organization does that. So they can find out information about another organization. Unions have used this many times to help unionize another organization. You take this out and this ordinance is fine. As an insurance agent in this town I would make more money if we got rid of independent contractors and if more people had health insurance but there are a few mechanisms in this that are non-starters for a lot of people. It begs the question when the Chamber of Commerce is against this and when many department heads are against this and it is going to cost the City of Manchester more money, why would I go up to the NH House on Thursday and go against the Committee recommendation and ask for \$44,000 when this Board would be willing to take the money that I help get and spend it on an ordinance that is unfair and does not put everyone on an even playing field? The last time we met here I thought we were going to go back to the drawing board and put something together, which this Board could have unanimous consent on. That is where this should go. Bring it back to the drawing board. Bring it back here for something we can all agree on. Thank you for your attention.

Don Levasseur, 81 Poor Street, Manchester stated:

I have been a small businessman all my life. I am presently...well I will be 70 years old in September so I have been a businessman since I was about 18 years old running a grocery store. All of the businesses I have had were all tough businesses. We were always

responsible. We always tried to be nice to our employees and to our customers. I just don't understand why the City would want to put themselves in the position of being responsible for looking after everybody's income and whether they are getting hospitalization and things like that. I think we have adequate laws throughout the United States and throughout the State of New Hampshire and I think if anything it should be the State of New Hampshire that should look after this and not the City of Manchester that would push this. If you are going to be fair, you should be fair with everybody. Like somebody else said, do it with the restaurants. Do it with the grocery stores. Do it with everybody. Somebody said there is a lot of unhappiness because of the contractors. It sounds like a dirty word after awhile but all contracts are done with sub-contractors. I hate to tell you this and I hate to break the news to everybody but that is the way the business is run and has been run for years on end. I have been to many other countries in this world and I am always so happy to come back to the good old USA and see the freedoms that we have. You know what? All of those freedoms make the contractors responsible and they do things and when they don't do it properly they lose employees and new contractors come in and take their place. I think if you are going to sit down and pick on anybody, do it on everybody. Don't do it on one area of business. It should be for all businesses and I think we have those laws on the books already. We don't need new laws. I can see the major cost on this here. It is just another layer of cost and that is all it is going to be. It is not going to accomplish anything at all. Thank you very much for listening to me. I did speak the last time and I am still against it and probably will be forever.

Ray Marquis, 14 Jefferson Street, Derry stated:

My experience is from touring the world and observing many cultures. My premise is that if you deny the workers their ability to be protected and to have the right to advance and have health protection then you will reap in later years the results. I do not wish to take from others the ability to make profit though not on the bodies of others. Most of you at this time of your life have hopefully done well. Please allow others the opportunity. It will add to you and not take away. I have been a contractor and know that many people say they will but the dollar always speaks loudly. Thank you.

Joe Levasseur, 866 Elm Street, Manchester stated:

I want to thank Alderman Shea for bringing forward a motion last week for the Parental Notification bill. I am sorry you didn't get the support of the Mayor and Aldermen but I do appreciate you bringing that forward and thank Senator Gatsas for voting for that. I would also like to thank Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas and Guinta for not going forward with the proposed increase in the taxes. I read in the paper today that Mayor Baines stated to Mark Pappas, a candidate for Mayor, that Mr. Pappas should sit down and learn more about budgets before he criticizes the tax increases that Manchester is once again facing. Mayor Baines who was so excited about baseball coming to Manchester quipped that our budget process is in the big leagues. First of all, Mayor, Mr. Pappas has worked on four state budgets, budgets that are in the billions of dollars and he knows first hand what making

budget cuts is all about. After watching you lead the charge to bring a minor league baseball stadium to the big leagues here in Manchester, isn't it about time that you sit down with the Aldermen and lead the charge on stopping the ridiculous overspending that is going on in the City of Manchester? Why are you not leading the charge or making stronger arguments for decreasing the size of government or cutting spending? All you have been doing in the paper is criticizing the Aldermen when you are the guy who is supposed to be in charge. We have watched you lead on all sorts of things over the last three and a half years but this budget for some reason you are standing pat. I also understand tonight that Mayor Baines wants the Aldermen to vote on spending \$28 million for a baseball stadium proposal without going to a public hearing. Why do you fear a public hearing on the baseball stadium proposal? Probably for the same reasons that you fear sending the question whether to bond the stadium to referendum and to the voters because you know that it will not pass. You know that the taxpayers of this City do not want to pay for this boondoggle. While Manchester welcomed the Mayor Baines idea of the big leagues, lots and lots of spending, high taxes, high rents and coming soon to the big leagues, minor league baseball. Now isn't that an oxymoronic statement at best? You should let the people vote on this and you should at least tonight not vote on spending that money or bonding that without a public hearing.

There being no one else present wishing to speak, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to take all comments under advisement and further to receive and file any written documentation presented.

This being a special meeting of the Board, no further business was presented and on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk